

PRELIMINARY Final Study Plan

I-90 Hyak to Easton Improvement Project

May 7, 2001



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

Preliminary Final Study Plan

This study plan, prepared in accordance with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Environmental Procedures Manual, dated November 1993, describes actions and processes requisite to accomplish NEPA and SEPA environmental planning and documentation to support the study of alternatives for improving Interstate 90 between mileposts 55 to 70 (Hyak to Easton) in Kittitas County, Washington. Reference project vicinity map attached.

Purpose of and Need for the Project

Purpose The purpose of the project is to meet projected traffic demands, improve public safety, and meet the identified project needs in a 15-mile stretch of I-90 (mileposts 55 – 70, approximately) between the communities of Hyak and Easton, in Kittitas County, Washington.

History Interstate 90 spans 300 miles in Washington from the Port of Seattle to the Idaho state line, then continues east across the United States. The Washington State Department of Transportation is developing a plan which will improve a portion of this corridor on the eastern side of Snoqualmie Pass, from Milepost 55 (Snoqualmie Pass/Hyak vicinity) to Milepost 70 (west of Easton). This section is part of what once was old US Highway 10, the Sunset Highway.

The main roadway alignment, constructed in the 1950s, consisted of a two-lane concrete road and was constructed with a snow shed protecting the roadway in the vicinity of present-day milepost 58. In the 1970s, old Highway 10 was realigned to meet interstate design standards, and an additional two-lane concrete roadway was constructed parallel to it. These two roadways became part of the country's Interstate Highway System, I-90. The new alignment used the existing snow shed to protect the westbound lanes, but nothing was constructed to protect the eastbound lanes in this avalanche-prone area.

The existing roadway is Portland Cement Concrete Pavement (PCCP). The estimated life of the PCCP was 30 years. In the early 1980s pavement cracking and panel settlement of the sections that were built in the late 1950s became apparent, and projects were developed to grind and retrofit the worst areas. By 1994 virtually all of the pavement from Hyak to Easton Hill was showing signs of deterioration. Recent projects that have overlaid the worst areas with Asphalt Concrete Pavement (ACP), and ground and retrofitted some of the other areas, will extend the life of the roadway another 7-10 years.

I-90 Today

Interstate 90 is the main east-west transportation corridor across Washington State and is vital to the state's economy, including shipping, recreation and business travel. More than 28,000 vehicles cross the pass daily, including 8,000 freight trucks. Traffic over the pass is expected to at least double in the next 20 years. A sound multi-modal transportation system is needed to support the existing economy, facilitate desired growth, reduce the costs of congestion and inefficiency, and serve as a link to promote success in all regions.

Washington is the most trade-dependent state in the country, according to the Washington State Economic Development Board. It is uniquely positioned as a gateway to the global economy. Maintaining transportation connections between ports, manufacturing and industrial centers, agricultural regions, and other key locations directly benefits the health of the state's economy.

Washington State possesses both a diverse geography and economy. Agriculture, wood products, fishing, aerospace, biomedical, manufacturing, technology-related or other industry all depend on the transportation network to move customers, employees, goods and supplies. A sound network means lower transportation costs which are then passed on to consumers as lower prices for goods, to workers as higher wages, and to owners of businesses as higher income.

Need (Known Deficiencies)

- **Avalanches**

Interstate 90 is frequently closed due to avalanches and associated control work. These closures strand motorists and freight on the pass resulting in substantial safety hazards to the traveling public, travel delays, and impacts to the state's economy. The traveling public and movement of goods remains at risk as long as the problem is not addressed. The risk will increase exponentially to traffic growth.

- **Slope Instability**

Interstate 90 has several unstable slopes which result in rock and debris falling onto the roadway causing damage to property and loss of life. These slopes will continue to pose a threat to property and safety if they are not addressed.

- **Structural Deficiencies**

The pavement on Interstate 90 is beyond its design life and the roadway is in a state of rapid deterioration. If it is not fixed, continual deterioration of the roadway will result in unsafe driving conditions, increased vehicle damage, travel delay and eventual failure of the roadway.

- **Traffic Volumes**

Traffic volumes on Interstate 90 are growing at an estimated three and one half percent per year. Currently these traffic volumes exceed the highway design capacity during peak travel periods. During the 20-year design period of the proposed action traffic volumes are expected to double and this condition is expected to worsen. The worsened traffic situation will lead to higher accident rates, adverse economic impacts and increased travel times, which greatly reduces the ability of the interstate to function as a safe and efficient roadway.

- **Ecological Connectivity**

Previous studies have identified the need to correct ecological connectivity barriers created by the existing I-90 facility in the vicinity of the proposed project. Enhancing and improving the biological permeability of the roadway corridor will help achieve the goals of the Northwest Forest Plan for improving ecological connectivity within the Snoqualmie Pass Adaptive Management Area. Improving connectivity across the I-90 corridor will help reduce demographic and genetic isolation of species and reduce the risks to wildlife and the public from vehicle/wildlife encounters.

Effects of the Proposed Project

Construction of this project will improve safety by rebuilding the roadway to current design standards, increase traffic capacity by adding two lanes, reduce road closures by addressing avalanche and rock slide problem areas, restore structural integrity of the roadway, and increase ecological connectivity.

Scope of the Work

Alternatives

Six alternatives under consideration for this project include five “build” alternatives and the “no action “ alternative. Four of the “build” alternatives follow the common route, and the other “build” alternative constructs a new route south of Lake Keechelus.

Common Route Build Alternatives

This 15-mile project has been divided into five sections. They are:

Section I: Coal Creek to Rocky Run Creek MP 55.10 to MP 57.00

Section II: Rocky Run Creek to Keechelus Dam MP 57.00 to MP 60.60

Section III: Keechelus Dam to Cedar Creek MP 60.60 to MP 64.80

Section IV: Cedar Creek to the top of Easton Hill MP 64.80 to MP 67.40

Section V: Top of Easton Hill to W. Easton I/C MP 67.40 to MP 70.3

Section I

Four different options are being considered for Section 1. They are as follows:

- A:** Realign the curve through the Gold Creek Valley using a much larger (1,550 meter) radius. Construct a 30-meter bridge over Coal Creek, and construct a 600-meter bridge over the Gold Creek Valley.
- B:** Realign the curve through the Gold Creek Valley using a much larger (1,550 meter) radius. Construct a 600-meter bridge over the Gold Creek Valley.
- C:** Realign the curve through the Gold Creek Valley using a larger (900 m) radius. Construct a 30-meter bridge over Coal Creek, and construct a 100-meter bridge over Gold Creek.
- D:** Realign the curve through the Gold Creek Valley using a larger (900 m) radius. Construct a 100-meter bridge over Gold Creek.

Section II

Four different options are being considered for Section 2. They are as follows:

- A:** Straighten the alignment of I-90 from just east of Wolf Creek to east of Slide Curve to by constructing a 3,000-meter tunnel.
- B:** Straighten the alignment of I-90 by constructing a tunnel through Slide Curve using the west portal as protection from the snow avalanche area. The tunnel would be 1,900 meters.
- C:** Construct a long bridge in the location of the avalanche area, so that any avalanche could pass under the roadway. Construct a 950-meter tunnel through Slide Curve.
- D:** Realign this section of I-90 by using larger radius curves required to meet minimum design standards. This results in building long bridges over the lake west of Slide Curve, and building into the hillside east of Slide Curve.

Section III

Four different options are being considered for Section 3. They are as follows:

- A:** Construct new alignment north of existing roadway with long bridges spanning from hill to hill. The Stampede Pass and Cabin Creek Interchanges would be removed and replaced by one interchange and a frontage road.
- B:** Construct new alignment north of the existing roadway with shorter bridges than option A. The Stampede Pass and Cabin Creek Interchanges would be removed and replaced by one interchange and a frontage road.

- C:** Construct new alignment north of the existing roadway. This new alignment would be much shorter than options A and B, and would only require one long bridge. New 100-meter bridges would be constructed at the Price Creek, Noble Creek, and Cedar Creek crossings. The Stampede Pass and Cabin Creek Interchanges would be removed and replaced by one interchange and a frontage road.
- D:** Stay on the existing alignment with only minor changes on some of the curve radii to bring them up to minimum design standards. Construct new 100-meter bridges at the Price Creek, Noble Creek, Swamp Creek, and Cedar Creek crossings.

Section IV

Options are very limited in Section 4. This section will be designed to best meet the needs at the lowest cost.

Section V

Three different alternatives are being considered for Section 5. They are as follows:

- A:** Realign the westbound lanes to be parallel with the eastbound lanes for 1,600 meters at the top of Easton Hill with a minimum width median. Modify the profile to provide a bridge for animals to pass underneath.
- B:** Realign the westbound curve near the top of Easton Hill using a larger radius to meet the minimum design standards. Construct an animal overpass above the westbound lanes. Modify the profile of the eastbound lanes to provide a bridge for animals to pass under.
- C:** Realign the westbound curve near the top of Easton Hill using a larger radius to meet the minimum design standards. Fencing or other means would be used to route animals so that they would pass under the new Hudson Creek bridge.

Route Themes

The various options for each section have been combined into four alternatives for the total project length with the following themes:

- a) Provide ***optimum alignment and connectivity*** (1A,2A,3A,4,5A)
- b) ***Near optimum alignment with high connectivity*** at priority locations (1B,2B,3B,4,5A)
- c) ***Favorable alignment and connectivity*** – balance operations and capitol costs (1C,2C,3C,4,5B)
- d) ***Improved alignment and connectivity*** – lowest capitol cost (1D,2D,3D,4,5C)

The alternatives listed above present all of the options developed for each section. The actual preferred alternative could be one of the listed alternatives, or a different combination of the section options.

New Route Alternative

The new route alternative proposed to build a new alignment south of the existing roadway from the Hyak I/C to the Cabin Creek I/C. The new alignment would build all six lanes south of Lake Keechelus, and would maintain at least a 60-meter buffer from the shoreline of the lake. This new route alternative would have 4(f) impacts to the John Wayne Trail and the Crystal Springs Campground. There would also be a chance for impacts to historical property. This alternative has many negative impacts, and the only reason it would be considered is if there are ESA issues on the north side of the lake, and tunneling north of the lake is not possible due to the rock/slide plane formations.

No Action Alternative

This alternative consists of preservation of the existing roadway, structures, interchanges, drainage, and safety features. Recognizing that the existing concrete pavement is cracked and deteriorated, the pavement would be rehabilitated periodically by a series of asphalt pavement overlay projects. These projects would become more frequent as increased traffic volumes are experienced. No improvements are proposed.

Areas of Primary Importance

The primary purposes of the I-90 improvements are to enhance safety, prevent highway closures, and increase the capacity of the highway to meet future requirements.

Secondary objectives of the project are to reduce maintenance costs, minimize impacts of construction, and maintain aesthetics.

Areas of Potential Controversy

Wildlife and habitat connectivity – This portion of Interstate 90 nearly bisects the Snoqualmie Pass Adaptive Management Area (AMA). According to the Final EIS for the AMA plan, Interstate 90 is, "...a hindrance to the movement of some species associated with late-successional habitats, which may fragment populations and lead to reduced population viability." In addition, migrating elk and deer endanger themselves and the traveling public when crossing the highway. Where and when reasonable (i.e., practical and feasible from a technical and economical standpoint), design changes that benefit connectivity for wildlife species through this corridor will be implemented.

Threatened and endangered species – This project is located in the Cascade Range, which provides habitat for two listed species, northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet. In addition, the project corridor is

located within the headwaters of the Yakima River. The Yakima River provides habitat for two threatened species, bull trout and mid-Columbia steelhead. Potential habitat impacts associated with the I-90 improvement project are anticipated to be:

- Temporary direct impacts to water quality during construction, and
- Long-term indirect water quality impacts as part of ongoing maintenance.

Wetlands – Some of the proposed design improvements to the I-90 corridor will require work within wetlands, which may include excavation, fill, and pilings.

Recreation – Iron Horse State Park begins near North Bend and terminates at the Columbia River. Where the park follows the old Milwaukie Road right-of-way, it is also named the John Wayne Pioneer Trail. This light gravel trail is used by hikers, bicyclists, equestrians, wagons and cross-country skiers. As the trail is located along the western shore of Lake Keechelus, new freeway construction here will impact trail users. During the public meetings described later, potential impacts to this State Park have attracted substantial attention.

Compliance with other management plans and initiatives - In addition to the applicable USFS plans, other management plans apply to lands within the I-90 corridor. The Mountains to Sound Greenway Implementation Plan provides guidelines intended to blend the highway into the regional landscape in an environmentally sensitive way. Management objectives within Forest Service management plans for the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie and Wenatchee National Forests will be considered as well. Finally, this stretch of I-90 is part of the National Scenic Byways Program administered by the FHWA, the only interstate in the country on this system.

Cultural Resources – Based on existing historical data, some cultural resource may be impacted during construction of proposed improvements. Additional study will determine more precise locations of such resources, as well as potential mitigation opportunities.

Section 4(f) Department of Transportation Act/Section 6(f) Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Involvement

Potential sites identified to date which may be impacted by the proposal include public recreation areas (John Wayne Pioneer Trail, Crystal Springs Campground), a possible historical structure (snowshed), wildlife community/habitat, and wetlands.

Summary of Public Involvement

Community Coordination

A public informational meeting was held on April 27, 1999, at the Hal Holmes Center in Ellensburg, WA. Approximately 10 persons attended.

A public informational meeting was held on April 29, 1999, at the Mt. Si Center in North Bend, WA. Approximately 10 persons attended.

A public scoping meeting was held on February 23, 2000, at the Cle Elum Ranger Station in Cle Elum, WA. Approximately 60 persons attended.

Future public involvement plans are detailed in Appendix A, Public Involvement Plan.

Interagency Coordination

The US Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District is assisting WSDOT with environmental planning and preparation of the EIS under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 USC 4321 *et seq.*), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidelines (40CFR 1500-1508), and US Department of Transportation/FHWA rules (23 CFR 771). WSDOT is the lead agency under the Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA, Chapter 43.21C RCW) and the SEPA guidelines (Chapter 197-10 WAC). Environmental documentation prepared will satisfy requirements of both NEPA and SEPA.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is initiating the Interagency Working Agreement to Integrate Special Aquatic Resources (404) Permit Requirements into the National Environmental Policy Act and the State Environmental Policy Act Processes in the State of Washington (Merger Agreement), dated August 12, 1996. Participating agencies include the Federal Highway Administration, Region 10, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, Washington State Department of Transportation, US Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10, and US Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 1.

Other environmental review, coordination and permit requirements include (but are not limited to):

- Preparation of a Sec 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis under the Clean Water Act for permitting by the Corps of Engineers Regulatory Branch
- Section 401 permit under the Clean Water Act
- Consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act
- Coordination with US Fish and Wildlife Service under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act
- Hydraulic Project Approval
- Shoreline Substantial Development permit

Cooperating Agencies

US Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle District
US Forest Service, Cle Elum Ranger District

Studies to be Prepared and Areas of Responsibility

Interdisciplinary Approach

This project has been identified as one that can be expected to have significant social, economic, and environmental impacts. In accordance with the *Design Manual*, an Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) has been appointed.

The IDT will function as an advisory board to the District Administrator. The duties and responsibilities of the IDT include:

- Review and approval of this Study Plan and the appended Public Involvement Plan.
- Evaluation of alternative courses of action.
- Preparation of reports (data and conclusions of technical studies, views of citizen, officials, and groups).
- Submission of recommendations to the Project Manager.

Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) Chairman, IDT Members, and Project Manager

The IDT for this project is made up of the following members from the disciplines indicated:

Paul Gonseth, Chairman.....WSDOT Civil Engineering
George Hilsinger.....WSDOT Civil Engineering
Ray Yates.....WSDOT Materials

Gary Beeman.....	WSDOT Environmental
Terry Kukes.....	WSDOT Maintenance
Floyd Rogalski.....	US Forest Service
Brent Renfrow.....	WDFW
Bill Noble.....	US Fish and Wildlife

The Project Manager is George Hilsinger.

Michael Kulbacki of the FHWA and Ann Robinson of the USACE attend most of the IDT meetings in a regulatory capacity.

Discipline Studies to be Prepared

1. **NEPA/SEPA analysis:** Scope, evaluate and write DEIS. Lead: TBD.
2. **Endangered Species Act evaluation/consultation:** Write Biological Assessments, consult as necessary. Lead: Aquatic Species – Jones & Stokes (tentative); Terrestrial Species – Forest Service
3. **Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act compliance:** Obtain Planning Aid Letter, Coordination Act Report from USFWS. Lead: Jeff Laufle
4. Technical evaluations of affected resources (note that coordination/scoping with the resource agencies and the literature search may reveal the need for field studies in some areas and not in others):
 - a. **Fish.** (WSDOT, with Jones & Stokes) Evaluate fish habitat and use, analyze impacts and potential mitigation.
 - b. **Wildlife community/habitat/4(f).** (WSDOT, with USFS) The scope of this study will be coordinated with local, state, and federal resource agencies. Wildlife species within the project area will be identified along with the identification of any threatened or endangered species. Additional field studies to inventory wildlife will be conducted on a limited basis when necessary to augment existing data.

The potential impacts of construction and operation of each alternative will be assessed. Possible mitigation measures will be identified for significant impacts.
 - c. **Forest community.** (Lead TBD) Evaluate forest biome, analyze impacts and potential mitigation.
 - d. **Wetlands/4(f).** (Kathy Kunz, with USFWS) The scope of this study will be coordinated with local, state, and federal agencies and applicable wetlands regulations.

Wetlands in the alignment corridor will be mapped to determine general species composition, a measure of productivity, and sensitivity.

The impacts of construction and operation of each alternative will be assessed. A regional and site-specific discussion of potential wetlands impacts will be prepared for each alternative. The site-specific discussions will identify areas of potentially significant impacts on wetlands along each alternative alignment. The analyses will include discussions of cumulative, primary,

secondary, and both short- and long-term impacts. It is anticipated that the major study emphasis will be the destruction or modification of wetlands due to new construction. Secondary impacts to wetlands will be analyzed in detail in site-specific cases where regulatory agencies feel this is necessary.

The impact discussion will be followed by mitigation measures recommended at each impact location which will minimize or avoid impacts on wetlands.

A separate Wetlands Finding document will be prepared as required by federal regulations.

- e. **Hydraulics/hydrology/floodplain.** (Mike Deering, with TetraTech) The analysis of baseline surface water resources in relation to the proposed project will include a summary description of stream locations and flood plain boundaries.

Each alternative will be compared to existing Federal Flood Insurance Maps to determine the extent of any flood plain encroachment. Local, state, and federal water resource flood plain management agencies will be identified and contacted to determine if any of the alternatives conflict with established plans, policies, or goals.

It is assumed that none of the alternatives will impact the 100-year flood plain; therefore, a quantitative assessment is not needed.

If necessary, a Flood Plain Finding will be prepared in accordance with FHPM 6-7-3-2.

- f. **Water quality.** (Mike Deering, with TetraTech) Existing surface water resources will be identified, including:

- Stream locations;
- Stream classifications;
- Water withdrawals;
- Water discharges, and
- Existing storm water management programs.

A discussion of water quality baseline conditions with a comparison to applicable standards will be prepared.

The impacts of construction and operation of each alternative will be assessed and discussed. Each alternative's impact discussion will include a regional and site-specific perspective. The site-specific discussions will identify significant impact areas along each alternative alignment and give detailed impact analyses for those areas.

Mitigation measures will be proposed for all significant adverse impacts.

- g. **HTRW.** (Mike McNeely, with Jones & Stokes) This report will evaluate the probability of encountering contaminants in soil and groundwater, which is anticipated to be low. The report will focus on describing measures that would be taken if a hazardous waste site is discovered during construction, as well as potential mitigation.

- h. **Cultural resources/archeology/4(f).** (WSDOT, with EWU) Locate and evaluate unrecorded historic properties within the area of potential effect. Evaluate affected historic properties. Initiate and maintain agency, tribal, and State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination.
- i. **Air quality.** (Mike McNeely, with Jones & Stokes) Because the proposed project will be located in either undeveloped areas of or within the existing Interstate 90 corridor, it is assumed that there will be minimal air quality impacts. In order to document this, a simplified analysis will be performed for each alternative based on nomographic estimates of CO microscale air quality impacts. One “worst case” calculation is assumed for each alternative.
A brief report documenting that there will be no significant impacts and compliance with the SIP should be all that is required.
- j. **Noise.** (Mike McNeely, with Jones & Stokes) Sensitive receptors will be identified on appropriate base maps for each alternative.
Three “worst case” locations per alternative will be selected for analysis. Field monitoring will be accomplished for each of the nine “worst case” impact areas. It is assumed that one monitoring point will be needed per impact area to adequately describe ambient conditions.
Future noise levels will be predicted for each alternative, based on use of FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. Where significant noise impacts are identified, mitigation alternatives will be discussed.
- k. **Visual/aesthetics.** (Mark Maurer, WSDOT OSC (Tentative)) Evaluate visual environment, analyze impacts and potential mitigation. The evaluation will be aimed at assisting interested individuals and groups to visualize and compare the alternatives.
- l. **Transportation & Traffic.** (Lead TBD) This report will document existing traffic conditions within the project corridor, including major bottlenecks and points of congestion. Peak-hour volumes will be compared with roadway capacity, and the resultant “level of service” calculations will identify areas of capacity need. Traffic will be calculated on a seasonal as well as on a yearly basis. Local traffic studies will be prepared as needed.
Future travel demand will be predicted on the same bases.
A discussion of the impacts of each alternative on traffic flow and circulation will be included in the report to allow comparisons.
- m. **Recreation/4(f).** (Lead TBD) This report will evaluate the probable effects of the project on public recreational areas. Direct and indirect impacts to Iron Horse State Park/John Wayne Trail will be covered in detail to form the basis for the Section 4(f) evaluation. Mitigation measures, include those required by either Section 4(f) or Section 6(f), will be identified and discussed.
- n. **Land Use & Socioeconomic Impacts.** (Lead TBD) This report will cover the subject areas of Overall Economic Activity, Regional and Community Growth, Land Use, Disruptions and Changes in Community Character, Employment, Property Values, and Taxes.

An overall framework of socioeconomic data will be assembled in order to establish baseline conditions and to describe likely future land use and socioeconomic conditions. The work will be based on established land use planning assumptions available from Kittitas County. Proposed land use plans and programs which have a bearing on the project will be analyzed. The consistency or inconsistency of the alternatives with these plans or programs will be evaluated. Indirect impacts of potential induced development as a result of the project will be explored.

The effects of the alternatives will be evaluated in terms of social and economic factors and changes in the quality of life in the study area. An important concern will be the potential impacts of changes in local activity patterns and access to community facilities. Probably impacts on institutions and public facilities, such as schools, churches, and other facilities, will be discussed. Local economic impacts will be evaluated, including changes in property values, tax revenues, potential induced growth, retail sales, and employment opportunities, to the extent possible. The various socioeconomic impacts will be assessed by first describing the magnitude and incidence of such impacts. Selected data from the socioeconomic analysis will be used to make

- o. **Farm Lands.** (Lead TBD) No substantial agricultural acreage is farmed within the project corridor. A brief report documenting that no major impacts are anticipated and that construction and operation of the project will not affect local farm land/farm product availability, nor require the development of new farm lands, should be all that is required.
- p. **Energy.** (Lead TBD) It is assumed that energy impacts will be insignificant. A brief report documenting that no significant impacts are anticipated and that construction and operation of the project will not affect local fuel availability nor require the development of new energy sources should be all that is required.
- q. **Environmental Justice.** (Lead TBD) Using data from the Socioeconomic Analysis, as well as independent research and analysis if necessary, possible effects on minorities and low-income populations will be documented. Any disproportionate impacts to those two population sub-groups will be recorded.
- r. **Right-of-Way Acquisition/Displacement.** (Lead TBD) This report will address any displacements that would be caused by construction of each alternative. If displacements are likely to be caused by an alternative, the report will include the data specified in the NEPA Environmental Impact Statement Outline, including a description of the relocation services available to individuals or entities displaced.
- s. **Geology & Soils.** (Lead TBD) A general baseline description of existing geologic structure, soils, and topography for the project corridor will be prepared. The presence of geologic faults will be described and mapped as they relate to the project.

- t. **Utilities/Irrigation.** (Lead TBD) A general baseline description of existing electric, gas and fiber optic utility corridors which are within or adjacent to the project area. Descriptions of existing reservoirs and irrigation transmission facilities will be prepared as well.
- 5. Permitting documentation:
 - a. Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA): Prepare documentation as required for the various aspects. Lead: Jeff Laufle.
 - b. Sec. 401: Lead: Jeff Laufle/Wayne Wagner.
 - Hydraulic Project Approval: Lead: Jeff Laufle
 - 404 Alternatives Analysis: Lead: Kathy Kunz
 - Shoreline Mgmt. Act: Lead: Jeff Laufle
 - Floodplain mgmt/critical areas: Lead: Wayne Wagner
 - c. Cultural Resources: Lead: David Grant
- 6. Agency/tribal coordination: Maintain contact and information flow, document review, etc., with agency and tribal reps. Lead: Jeff Laufle, Miriam Ramsey, with contractor.
- 7. Public input: Maintain public contact, coordinate public review. Lead: WSDOT.

Education and Experience of Discipline of Study Preparers

Jeffrey C. Laufle, Environmental Coordinator, BS Natural Resources, University of Michigan, 1978; MS Fisheries Science, University of Washington, 1982. Senior fisheries biologist for Seattle District. Provides environmental compliance for projects under NEPA, ESA, Clean Water Act, other regulations. Habitat restoration project manager.

Kathleen S. Kunz, Biologist, B.A and MA in Geography from California State University, Fullerton. Serves as the Seattle District's wetland expert and environmental compliance liaison. Manages the wetland and environmental training program. Provides expert preparation, analysis and review of projects subject to evaluation under the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, Superfund (CERCLA/SARA), the National Environmental Policy Act, and other environmental review work. Designs, implements and teaches wetland delineation courses and wetland field botany courses throughout the Pacific Northwest for a variety of governmental personnel.

Manpower and Budget Requirements

Currently being revised

Project Schedule

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Estimated Date</u>
Concurrence Point 1	3/01
Preliminary Alternatives Selected	6/01
Public Open House	8/01
Concurrence Point 2	12/01
Preliminary Draft EIS to Agencies	9/02
Concurrence Point 3	11/02
Circulate DEIS	12/02
Public Hearing	1/03
Concurrence Point 4	3/03
Circulate FEIS	5/03
Record of Decision	7/03

Date and Location of Agency Scoping Meeting

The first agency scoping meeting took place February 1, 2000 at 9:00 am at the Cle Elum Ranger District Conference Room, Cle Elum, WA.

Orientation Meeting

Appendix A

Public Involvement Plan

Informational Program

Community Meetings

Notification

Project Hearing

Appendix B

Traffic Data

DRAFT AGENDA
Project Liaison Staff Meeting
Wednesday, May 29, 2002

Department of Ecology
Cafeteria Room 1S-16
10:00 am – 3:00 pm

10:00 – 10:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome and introductions <i>Judy Stratton & All</i>
10:15 --10:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summary on TPEAC – how it affects liaisons• Referendum – what's at stake, what liaisons can say or do, how will the outcome affect liaisons? <i>Peter Downey, WSDOT TEPAC Manager</i>
10:45 – 11:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compliance inspection checklist <i>Scott Carey, WSDOT</i>
11:15 – 11:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nationwide permits and training schedule <i>Sandi Manning</i>
11:30 --12:30	Lunch (on your own)
12:30 --1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Merger/SAC agreement update – how will liaison responsibilities change <i>Terry Swanson, Ecology</i>
1:00 – 1:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ESHB 2866 – exempts WDFW from providing stormwater conditions on HPA's in areas covered by municipal permits <i>Sandi Manning</i>
1:30 – 2:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Logistical Issues <i>Judy Stratton and Sandi Manning</i>
2:30 – 3:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other issues
3:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adjourn

